



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON CORREPTION IN HIATUS

BY EDWARD BULL CLAPP

It is a familiar fact that in Greek hexameter poetry diphthongs and long vowels at the end of a word, followed in the same verse by a word beginning with a vowel, are usually treated as short (*vocalis ante vocalem corripitur*). But the explanation of this correption is uncertain, its relation to the tolerance of hiatus is obscure, and even the elementary facts concerning the extent and proportions of the usage itself, the vowels and diphthongs in which it appears most frequently, and the difference in practice among the different poets, are loosely stated in the most recent handbooks. It has therefore seemed worth while to make a new and somewhat extended examination of this feature of dactylic verse, covering a considerable number of poets from the earliest to the latest times. Such an examination may furnish us at least with a clear general view of the extent of the practice and the circumstances under which it occurs, and at the same time may shed some light on the difficult problem of its origin and explanation.

The poets whose usage has been noted are twenty-six in number, and the list includes the chief representatives of the epic, classical, Alexandrian, Roman, and Byzantine periods. Certain poets of great intrinsic importance are passed over because we possess too little of their work to afford a sufficient basis for observation. The parts of Homer examined were chosen from among the earliest, as well as the latest, portions of the poems, in the hope of finding such a difference of usage as should be significant. But no such marked difference was found to exist. Homeric correption is fairly constant from A to ω , and the slight differences have no apparent significance for our inquiry. In most cases at least 1,000 consecutive verses of each poet were examined,¹ or the

¹ It was found that the practice of each poet, in regard to correption, was reasonably uniform, and that nothing of importance was likely to be gained by including more than 1,000 verses in the study.

whole extant remains of poets from whom a less number of hexameters are preserved. The few exceptions to this rule will be seen in the following table, which shows in detail the portions of each poet on which the later tables are based:

	Verses
Homer, A, B 484-877, K, X, ι, ω [Dindorf-Hentze]	3,213
Hesiod, Theogony	1,022
Homeric Hymns to Del. and Pyth. Apollo, and Hermes	1,126
Tyrtæus	145
Solon	220
Theognis	1,430
Simonides	364
Empedocles	419
Theocritus, Idylls i-xxii	2,062
Aratus	1,154
Manetho, ii [i], iii [ii]	930
Callimachus	1,356
Apollonius Rhodius i	1,362
Moschus	229
Bion	209
[Phocylides]	230
Nicander, Theriaca	958
Oppian, De venatione i, ii.	1,166
Quintus Smyrnaeus i, ii	1,496
Dionysius Periegetes	1,186
[Orphic] Argonautica	1,373
Nonnus, Dionysiaca i, ii	1,246
Colluthus, Helen	385
Musæus, Hero and Leander	341
Tryphiodorus	673
Tzetzes, Antehomerica, Homerica 1-194	600

The following table shows the frequency of correction of the several diphthongs and long vowels in the different poets. The figures indicate the *average* number of instances to each 100 verses of text. The vowels and diphthongs are arranged in the order of prevailing frequency in the whole list of poets. This may aid the reader's eye to interpret the results, since the figures opposite each poet's name will in general diminish from left to right, so that any marked exception to this rule (as in the case of Theocritus) indicates a practice more or less unusual. The diphthongs *eu* and *av* are occasionally shortened, but they are omitted here to save space:

	αι	οι	ου	ει	φ	η	η	ω	ᾱ	α
Homer.....	16	7.3	1.5	1.6	1.5	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.0
Hesiod.....	19	4.1	4.7	1.7	1.9	1.2	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Homeric Hymns.....	18	6.0	3.0	1.2	1.5	1.3	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0
Tyrtæus.....	10	4.0	2.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0
Solon.....	12	2.3	1.4	1.9	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Theognis.....	16	4.5	1.4	1.5	0.6	1.6	1.0	0.6	0.1	0.1
Simonides.....	4	1.4	2.2	0.3	2.7	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Empedocles.....	24	3.6	0.7	2.4	0.5	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0
Theocritus.....	17	6.0	0.7	1.9	1.9	0.5	0.3	2.4	1.5	0.5
Aratus.....	17	6.4	1.9	1.5	1.9	0.9	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0
Manetho.....	13	3.2	2.6	1.2	1.7	2.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Callimachus.....	12	3.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
Apollonius Rhodius.....	15	6.3	2.2	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.0
Moschus.....	15	6.0	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bion.....	17	3.3	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
[Phocylides].....	10	2.6	1.3	0.9	0.4	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nicander.....	26	3.3	2.9	1.3	1.5	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1
Oppian.....	7	0.7	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0
Quintus Smyrnaeus.....	19	7.7	2.3	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.0
Dionysius Periegetes.....	21	4.6	1.7	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
[Orphic] Argonautica.....	11	4.5	1.6	0.8	1.2	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Nonnus.....	12	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0
Colluthus.....	16	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Musaëus.....	11	3.2	0.3	0.6	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Tryphiodorus.....	13	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tzetzes.....	13	3.5	2.0	0.2	1.7	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0

It will be seen from the above table that the diphthong *αι* is shortened, not only more frequently than any other single vowel or diphthong, but actually more frequently than all the other vowels and diphthongs combined. Of this very large number of cases of the correpction of *αι*, about three-fifths occur in the single word *καί*, while most of the remaining instances appear in the inflectional endings of verbs, especially *-ται* and *-μαι*, though there are a few nominatives plural. But it would appear that more than one-third of all the cases of correpction in hiatus in Greek poetry are furnished by *καί* alone. The following table shows the total number and distribution of the instances of shortened *αι*, adding in detail the practice of certain poets who display a marked divergence from the prevailing tendency. In general, the preponderance of *αι* over the other vowels and diphthongs is most overwhelming in Oppian, Nonnus, Colluthus, and Tryphiodorus, and in all of these but Nonnus the vast majority of cases appear in *καί*. In this connection it is significant that *καί* is practically never elided, although *κε* often suffers elision and *δέ* constantly.

	καί	Verbal Ending	Scattering
Total number	2,266	1,487	191
Theognis	89	128	7
Solon	5	22	0
Theocritus	180	110	53
Aratus	111	149	32
Colluthus	56	3	0

The diphthong *οι* is shortened only one-fourth as often as *αι*. The nominative plural furnishes almost exactly one-half of all the cases of short *οι*, and most of the remainder occur in the datives *οί, σοι, μοι*. In view of the fact that the accentual law for final *οι* is the same as for final *αι* (*ἄνθρωποι, θάλασσαι*), the different behavior of the two diphthongs in hiatus is remarkable. The following table shows (1) what may be called the natural frequency of final *οι* and *αι* as seen in Thucydides and Xenophon; (2) the frequency of correction in hiatus (in hexameter) in the same diphthongs; (3) the frequency of correction in the nominative plural. The figures represent the average number to 100 lines of text.

	αι	οι
Natural frequency in prose	63	34
Frequency of correction in hexameter	15	4—
Frequency of correction in nominative plural	0.7	2—

The shortening of *ου* occurs only in the genitive singular. The diphthong *ει* is shortened most frequently in the word *ἐπεί*, and in the third person singular of verbs. Of the “improper” diphthongs, *ω* and *α* are shortened only in the dative singular. The same is true of *η* in the great majority of cases, though a few subjunctives appear. Of the long vowels, *η* appears as short chiefly in nominatives singular, and in the particles *δή, μή, ἤ*, and others, although the list in Theognis is much lengthened by that poet’s frequent use of the vocative *Πολυπαῖδην* (— — —). Correction of *ω* is seen most often in *ἐγώ*, and in the first person singular of verbs, except in Theocritus, where the many genitives in *-ω* introduce a new element.

After this preliminary survey of the extent and character of correption, we are prepared to take up the question of the origin and explanation of the practice. The question is a double one, as has already been hinted. We must endeavor to ascertain (1) why it was permissible to treat the long vowel or diphthong as short, and (2) why this correption was regarded as justifying hiatus. Both questions have been discussed with great thoroughness by Hartel in his *Homerische Studien* II, III (Wien, 1874), and by Grulich *De quodam hiatus genere* (Halle, 1876). But both of these scholars based their discussion almost entirely upon Homer alone. New light may reasonably be expected from a more extended field of observation.

The fact of correption was noticed by the ancient metricians. Aristides Quintilianus (p. 46, Meibom) says:

Τῷ γὰρ οὐκ ἔχειν μεταξύ σύμφωνον τὸ συνάπτον αὐτὰς [i. e., final and initial vowels], κεχρηότας ἀπεργαζόμεναι τοὺς ἤχους, τὴν τῆς φωνῆς διαλύου-
σιν εὐτονίαν· ἣ τε ἡμετέρα σπουδὴ τοῦ τὴν ἑτέραν ἐπιλαβεῖν, διὰ τὴν τῆς φωνῆς
συνέχειαν, πρὶν ἐντελῇ προσενέγκασθαι τὴν προτέραν, τῆς τοῦ καθηγουμένου τό-
νου μακρότητος ἀποτέμενεται.

This seems to mean: "Since the final and initial vowels have no consonant between to link them together, they leave a void (gaping) in the sound, interrupting the tension of the voice; and in our haste to reach the second sound, in order to preserve the continuity of the voice, we curtail the length of the preceding tone, before it has attained its full duration." This is clearly an effort to account for the *correption* only, and Hartel would appear to be in error when he says: "Aristides fasste richtig den Vorgang, nicht um die Erscheinung zu begründen, sondern vielmehr auszudrücken, dass und wie bei einem solchen Zusammenstoss der Vocale Hiatus vermieden werde." The words διὰ τὴν τῆς φωνῆς συνέχειαν may indeed refer to an effort to obviate the hiatus described in the first sentence of the quotation, but there is no clear statement of *how* this is accomplished. Why could not hiatus after a *short* vowel be obviated by a similar hastening of the voice to the second sound? Aristides may possibly have meant that this acceleration of movement, and consequent curtailment of

quantity, produced something of the same effect as crasis or elision, and thus rendered the hiatus unobjectionable. But his language certainly gives no hint of this.

Boeckh, in his *De metris Pindari* (p. 102), seems to follow Aristides, but adds an effort of his own to explain the allowance of hiatus:

Deinde si ultima prioris vocabuli est longa natura, sed nihilo secius corripitur [here he inserts a note referring to the passage quoted from Aristides], non habetur hiatus, quia vox, ut longam corripiat, adeo concitata pronuntiatione ad sequentis verbi initium transeat necesse est, ut vincat moram ab hiatus objectam.

Here Boeckh clearly grapples with the problem, though his solution of it is not fully satisfactory. Why can not the voice hasten over *every* long vowel in the same way? What part is played by the initial vowel of the next word? What connection has the practice of correption with other analogous phenomena of speech, such as crasis and synizesis? Boeckh's statement, when analyzed, seems to amount merely to this: "Because the void in sound is objectionable, we hasten the pronunciation in order to remove the difficulty and so the hiatus is overcome." But why can not this be done in *all* cases of hiatus alike?

Curtius, in his *Studien* I. 2, pp. 279 ff., regards the correption of *αι* and *οι* as "semi-elision," supporting this opinion by such crases as *καῖγώ* for *καὶ ἐγώ*, implying an intermediate form *κα'ἐγώ*. Cf. *οἱ ἐμοί*, (*ὁ ' ἐμοί*) *οὐμοί*. In the same way he would explain *δὴ ἐγώ* as *δὲ ' ἐγώ*. To this theory it has been objected that the metrical shortening which we are discussing appears most frequently in the diphthongs ending in *ι*, a vowel which is not often elided. But this objection is not fatal, since the elision of the whole diphthong *αι* is common enough in the verbal endings *-σθαι*, *-ται* (less so in *-μαι*, *-νται*), and even *ι* alone is very frequently elided in *ἐπί*, *ἀμφί*, the termination *-μι*, and elsewhere. The conjunction *καί*, to be sure, which furnishes so very large a proportion of the cases of metrical correption (see p. 242), is seldom, if ever, elided; but this fact need not be interpreted as unfavorable to the "semi-elision" theory. On the contrary, it may be regarded as distinctly supporting the opinion of Curtius.

W. Hartel, in the work referred to above (p. 243), noticed that correption in hiatus is most frequent in diphthongs consisting of a *short* vowel followed by *ι*, and on this fact he based a new effort to explain the practice. Believing that the usage began with these diphthongs, he assumed that in such combinations as *καὶ ἐγώ*, the final *ι* of the diphthong, standing between two vowels, under the influence of the rapid movement of dactylic verse, passed over into the corresponding consonantal sound of *jot*. The emergence of this consonantal sound at once removed the hiatus, and the preceding *-α-*, at the same time, being left by itself, appeared with its natural short quantity. Thus the verse (A 437)

ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βαῖνον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης

seems to show, at the end of the first foot, both irregular mensuration and hiatus. But if we write *ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοί*, neither hiatus nor irregularity of quantity is left.

O. Grulich (see p. 243) planted himself upon the position of Hartel, but he went farther than his predecessor, in that he endeavored to show how the practice of correption extended from the diphthongs mentioned to the other diphthongs, and so, finally, to the long vowels. In particular, he pointed to the locative ending *-οι* (which often served as a dative ending) as having perhaps assisted in establishing the tendency to shorten the regular dative ending in *ω*.¹

F. D. Allen, in his paper on "Greek Versification in Inscriptions" (*Papers of the American School at Athens* IV, pp. 120 f.), refers to the views of Hartel and Grulich as offering a possible explanation of the facts in question, but corrects these scholars in their error of extending the application of the principle (*καὶ ἐγώ* = *καὶ ἐγώ*) to the termination *-ου* of the genitive (*ἐκ Πύλου ἐλθών* = *ἐκ Πύλοφ ἐλθών*). Allen rightly calls attention to the fact that *-ου* in the genitive was never a real diphthong, so that it is impossible to speak of the "consonantization" of the second element.

The handbooks of metric give us little assistance. Christ (p. 38) says simply:

¹ Grulich does not, however, mention the Boeotian *-αι* for *-α*, which may have had an influence on the shortening of the latter.

Von einem Hiatus kann nicht mehr die Rede sein wenn . . . ein langer Vocal . . . in der Thesis verkürzt wird . . . , denn so wurden eben regelmässig die Vocale an den bezeichneten Stellen von den griechischen Schriftstellern behandelt.

Elsewhere (p. 26), however, he seems to endorse the views of Hartel and Grulich, and says:

Der Grund, dass die Kürzung gerade in der Thesis des Dactylus eintrat, lag in der raschen rollenden Aussprache, welche die Aufeinanderfolge mehrerer Kürzen mit sich brachte, und durch welche namentlich die Diphthonge sich leicht in ihr rein vocalisches und ihr halb-vocalisches Element auflösten.

Westphal (III. i, p. 122) combines the principle of "semi-elision" with the Hartel-Grulich consonantization of *ι* and *υ*. After comparing correction in hiatus with elision, he says:

Wie dort [i. e., in elision] die einzeitige kurze Vocal zur zeitlosen Vorschlagsilbe wird, so verliert hier [i. e., in hiatus] der zweizeitige lange Vocal die Hälfte seines Werthes, und wird zur einzeitigen Kürze. Besonders häufig werden von dieser Verkürzung die diphthongischen Auslaute, *αι*, *ει*, *οι*, und *ου* [but see p. 241] betroffen, deren zweiter Bestandtheil, das *ι* oder *υ*, hierbei in einen Halbvokal übergeht.

It thus appears that, while the convenient term "semi-elision" has found considerable favor as describing correction in hiatus, yet the consonantization theory of Hartel and Grulich has also been widely accepted as affording a more fundamental explanation of the process. It is at this point that the hope of more light from a wider field of investigation presents itself. As suggested by Allen in the paper cited (p. 121), if it should be found that after Homer the correction shows a tendency to spread more and more from the "short" diphthongs to the "improper" diphthongs and the simple long vowels, it would add considerably to our confidence that Hartel and Grulich were right; that the practice began with the diphthongs *αι*, *ει*, *οι*, *ευ*, as explained by those scholars, and that its appearance in other vowels and diphthongs is to be accounted for either by analogy or in some other way.

The results in detail have been set forth in the table on p. 241. But for the sake of clearness and sharpness of presentation, the

following table is added, in which those cases of correption which are satisfactorily explained by Hartel and Grulich are combined into one group ("A"), while those cases which represent the tendency toward the extension of the field of correption form another group ("B"). The diphthongs *eu* and *au* are ignored as before.

In 100 Verses	Total	A	B	Percent. A	Percent. B
Homer.....	30.1	24.9	5.2	0.83	0.17
Hesiod.....	33.8	24.8	9.0	0.73	0.27
Homeric Hymns.....	31.8	25.2	6.6	0.79	0.21
Tyrtæus.....	19.9	15.3	4.6	0.77	0.23
Solon.....	19.6	16.2	3.4	0.83	0.17
Theognis.....	27.4	22.0	5.4	0.80	0.20
Simonides.....	12.9	5.7	7.2	0.44	0.56
Empedocles.....	32.4	30.0	2.4	0.93	0.07
Theocritus.....	32.7	24.9	7.8	0.76	0.24
Aratus.....	30.2	24.9	5.3	0.82	0.18
Manetho.....	24.7	17.4	7.3	0.70	0.30
Callimachus.....	17.6	15.5	2.1	0.88	0.12
Ap. Rhodius.....	27.2	22.4	4.8	0.82	0.18
Moschus.....	23.4	21.8	1.6	0.93	0.07
Bion.....	23.3	21.3	2.0	0.91	0.09
[Phocylides].....	16.5	13.5	3.0	0.82	0.18
Nicander.....	36.5	30.6	5.9	0.84	0.16
Oppian.....	8.8	7.8	1.0	0.89	0.11
Q. Smyrnaeus.....	32.4	27.5	4.9	0.85	0.15
Dion. Periegetes.....	29.8	26.6	3.2	0.89	0.11
[Orph.] Argonautica.....	20.6	16.3	4.3	0.79	0.21
Nonnus.....	13.6	13.0	0.6	0.96	0.04
Colluthus.....	16.9	16.3	0.6	0.96	0.04
Musæus.....	16.6	14.8	1.8	0.89	0.11
Tryphiodorus.....	14.9	14.8	0.1	0.99	0.01
Tzetzes.....	22.1	16.7	5.4	0.76	0.24

The above table affords little evidence of steady progress, from Homer onward, in the direction of widening the field in which correption takes place. On the contrary, the practice of Homer is seen to be very nearly the mean or normal usage of the whole list. Hesiod, to be sure, shows a decidedly larger proportion of the less usual cases of curtailment of quantity (B) than Homer, but after Hesiod we find no further movement toward "B," of any consequence, except in Simonides. In this poet alone the cases under "B" are actually more numerous than those under "A," though this is due, not to a numerical increase in the former class, but to a marked falling-off in the latter. On the other hand, in the Homeric Hymns, Tyrtæus, Solon, and Theognis (the last three, like Simonides, employing the elegiac couplet), the proportion is much the same as in Homer, while in Empedocles there is a

decided reaction toward "A." The Alexandrian poets do not differ materially, in their usage, from their earlier models, except that in Moschus and Bion the tendency toward confining correption to the "A" diphthongs becomes still more marked. The poets of the Roman and Byzantine periods differ widely among themselves, but from Nonnus onward there is comparatively little correption of any kind, and the little that appears is confined more closely than ever to the diphthongs under "A." Tzetzes forms the only exception, and approaches very closely to the Homeric norm. It would be interesting to know whether this was studied, or unconscious, imitation of his great prototype.

In short, what little progress can be observed, from Homer to Tryphiodorus, lies in the direction of narrowing the range of correption, rather than of extending it. The opinion of Hartel and Grulich does not therefore receive the kind of confirmation which was hoped for (see p. 246). If correption began with the "short" diphthongs, and extended to the other diphthongs and long vowels by analogy, the process must have begun far back of our Homer, and reached its maximum effect in Hesiod and Simonides, after whose time it began to lose its force. Indeed, when we observe some of the remarkable variations and extremes of usage, as in Hesiod, Simonides, Empedocles, Nicander, Oppian, Tryphiodorus, we are forced to the conclusion that we are dealing, not with a process of phonetic or historical development, but with the peculiarities of individuals, or schools of poetry, which would probably find their explanation in a detailed study of the subject-matter, style, and vocabulary of the poets in question.

One question, however, may still be raised. We have examined the usage of the different poets as regards correption, and have based our conclusions upon the frequency with which one or another of the vowel-endings is shortened. But are we sure that the poets exercised any choice in this matter, conscious or unconscious? May it not be true that they shortened all vowel-endings, as they came to hand, with equal freedom, so that the frequency, for example, of short *ai* or *oi*, or the rarity of short *η* or *φ*, represents merely the frequency or the rarity of the *occurrence* of these endings, in the language which the poets wrote? If

it should appear that the results given in the table on p. 241, in regard to the relative frequency of correption in the different vowels and diphthongs, depend solely, or chiefly, upon the natural tendency of the Greek language, or of a given poet, to *use* words ending in these vowels or diphthongs, our whole investigation would be shown to be on the wrong path. It therefore seemed necessary to ascertain, not only the habit of each poet, in the matter of the use of the various vowel-endings, but also the usage of ordinary prose as shown in Thucydides and Xenophon. The following tables give the results. The first table indicates the number of times which the different vowel-endings appear in each poet, to each 100 lines of text (based, in most cases, on the reading of 600 consecutive lines), the usage of Thucydides and Xenophon being added below. The second table shows these same results combined into two groups as before (A=*αι, ει, ου*; B=the remaining diphthongs and long vowels), and, finally, exhibits what may be called the "tendency to shorten," which is obtained by comparing the number of *occurrences* of the endings in each group with the number of times they appear as short.

VOWEL ENDINGS

	αι	ει	ου	ει	φ	η	η	ω	ᾱ	α
Homer	42	28	11	14	9	28	10	15	3	1
Hesiod	44	15	9	9	12	29	11	8	3	1
Hom. Hymns	47	21	10	12	9	23	9	10	1	0
Tyrtæus	35	17	11	14	13	14	12	14	2	0
Solon	41	20	14	20	7	16	14	5	1	2
Theognis	47	22	16	18	8	22	14	10	1	2
Simonides	28	17	21	10	15	10	6	7	4	7
Empedocles	49	15	11	16	7	18	13	9	0	0
Theocritus	62	17	4	17	6	11	4	29	22	7
Aratus	74	34	19	15	12	25	12	6	0	0
Manetho	46	13	18	23	13	17	9	2	0	0
Callimachus	48	22	12	11	9	29	9	10	1	0
Apoll. Rhodius	35	23	12	6	11	20	13	9	1	1
Moschus	45	17	10	12	9	31	12	7	7	1
Bion	55	19	3	22	6	14	3	21	13	3
[Phocylides]	33	12	20	16	7	32	11	7	9	1
Nicander	50	16	18	19	11	26	11	2	0	1
Oppian	41	26	5	11	5	20	5	6	0	1
Q. Smyrnaeus	42	21	12	9	6	30	8	6	1	0
Dion. Periegetes	50	20	16	7	6	20	5	4	0	0
[Orphic] Argonautica	32	15	13	4	8	18	7	5	0	1
Nonnus	28	7	19	8	24	15	11	8	1	0
Colluthus	34	4	10	7	5	21	4	7	0	0
Musæus	30	9	18	9	8	21	7	9	1	0
Tryphiodorus	36	20	9	9	13	23	9	4	0	0
Tzetzes	29	19	14	10	9	14	6	2	1	0
Thuc. Xen.	63	34	21	13	17	22	11	4	2	5

	Vowel- Endings A	Vowel- Endings B	Shortened A	Shortened B	Tendency to Shorten A	Tendency to Shorten B
Homer.....	84	77	24.9	5.2	0.30	0.07
Hesiod.....	68	73	24.8	9.0	0.36	0.12
Hom. Hymns.....	80	62	25.2	6.6	0.32	0.11
Tyrtæus.....	66	66	15.3	4.6	0.23	0.07
Solon.....	81	59	16.2	5.4	0.20	0.06
Theognis.....	87	73	22.0	5.4	0.25	0.07
Simonides.....	55	70	5.7	7.2	0.10	0.10
Empedocles.....	80	58	30.0	2.4	0.38	0.04
Theocritus.....	96	83	24.9	7.8	0.26	0.09
Aratus.....	123	74	24.9	5.3	0.20	0.07
Manetho.....	82	59	17.4	7.3	0.21	0.12
Callimachus.....	81	70	15.5	2.1	0.19	0.03
Apoll. Rhodius.....	64	67	22.4	4.8	0.35	0.07
Moschus.....	74	77	21.8	1.6	0.29	0.02
Bion.....	96	63	21.3	2.0	0.22	0.03
[Phocylides].....	61	87	13.5	3.0	0.22	0.03
Nicander.....	85	69	30.6	5.9	0.36	0.09
Oppian.....	78	42	7.8	1.0	0.10	0.02
Q. Smyrnaeus.....	72	63	27.5	4.9	0.38	0.08
Dion. Periegetes.....	77	51	26.6	3.2	0.35	0.06
[Orphic] Argonautica.....	51	52	16.3	4.3	0.32	0.08
Nonnus.....	43	78	13.0	0.6	0.30	0.01
Calluthus.....	45	47	16.3	0.6	0.36	0.01
Musæus.....	48	64	14.8	1.8	0.31	0.03
Tryphiodorus.....	65	58	14.8	0.1	0.23	0.00 ¹ ₆
Tzetzes.....	58	46	16.7	5.4	0.29	0.12
Thuc. Xen.....	110	82				

From the above table it appears, as we should expect, that there is some connection between the frequency of use of the two classes of vowel-endings by the different poets, and the frequency of correction of the same endings. The very large proportion of corrections under "B" in Simonides, for example, in comparison with those under "A," goes hand in hand with a somewhat larger proportion of occurrences of the same endings. Something of the same sort, too, may be seen in the figures for Hesiod and Theocritus. And in Empedocles, on the other hand, a large proportion of A-endings is accompanied by a large proportion of A-corrections. But in Aratus the A-endings are extraordinarily numerous, while the A-corrections are no more frequent than in Homer. In Nonnus, whose comparative fondness for the B-endings is greater than that of any other poet, the cases of correction in these endings are insignificant in number. If the frequency of correction were *closely* dependent upon the frequency of occurrence, we should expect that the figures in the last two columns of the last table, representing the "tendency to correction" in the two classes, would be approximately constant throughout the list.

But, as a matter of fact, the tendency to shorten "A," in Simonides, is precisely the same as the tendency to shorten "B," while in Tryphiodorus the former is more than 100 times as great as the latter. Hesiod shortens one-third of his A-endings and one-eighth of his B-endings, while Moschus, who shortens nearly one-third of his A-endings, curtails but one-fiftieth of his B-endings. These facts, together with others of a similar nature, which may be gathered from the table, compel us once more to admit that the practice of correpion in hiatus is, after all, largely a personal matter—a feature of style—in which the poet was guided, to a great extent at least, by the traditions of the school to which he belonged, or the preference of his individual taste.

The results of our discussion may be summed up as follows:

1. Throughout the whole range of Greek hexameter poetry, correpion in hiatus tends to confine itself, more or less closely, to the diphthongs *αι*, *ει*, *οι*. It does not extend itself freely to all vowel-endings, nor does the frequency of correpion of the various endings depend, to any great extent, upon the frequency of occurrence of the same endings. An element of choice, or fitness, must certainly enter into the problem.

2. The consonantization theory of Hartel and Grulich offers too exact and satisfactory an explanation of at least some of the phenomena of correpion to be wholly rejected. In regard to the diphthongs *αι*, *ει*, *οι*, it accounts both for the curtailment of quantity and for the tolerance of hiatus, and in a way which seems open to no reasonable criticism. The fact that these diphthongs furnish an overwhelming majority of all the cases of correpion is therefore distinctly favorable to this view rather than to Curtius' doctrine of semi-elision, for there is no good reason why the latter process should confine itself so largely to these particular diphthongs. Moreover, correpion in hiatus is peculiarly characteristic of the dactylic foot, and especially of the last syllable of the foot, where the dactylic rapidity of movement is most strongly felt. This fact, too, supports the consonantization theory, rather than that of semi-elision, since elision does not appear to depend in the least on rapid movement, while the development of a consonant sound from *ι* is certainly assisted by rapid utterance.

3. If correption in hiatus began with the diphthongs *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, in accordance with this theory, its origin must go back to forms of poetry older than our Homer, since in the earliest as well as the latest portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* we find a tolerably settled and stereotyped usage; a usage, moreover, in which correption has already spread considerably to the other diphthongs and the long vowels. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as we have them, do not therefore stand at the beginning, but rather at the end, of the development of this poetic license. Whatever tendency can be detected in the later poets toward extending correption still more freely to all diphthongs and long vowels (as to a slight extent in Hesiod, Simonides, Manetho) must be regarded as poetic experiment, and in a direction which did not meet the approval of the other poets in question.

4. The general tendency of later times, in this as in so many other features of metrical usage, is toward the abridgment of freedom, and the setting up of fixed conventional standards. In many of the later poets, correption of any endings except *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, practically disappears.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA